

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 527

SO 031 009

AUTHOR Reardon, Betty A.
TITLE Educating the Educators: The Preparation of Teachers for a Culture of Peace. Peace Education Miniprints No. 99.
INSTITUTION School of Education, Malmo (Sweden).
ISSN ISSN-1101-6418
PUB DATE 1999-05-00
NOTE 25p.; Revised version of a paper presented at the World Conference on Higher Education, UNESCO (Paris, France, October 1998).
AVAILABLE FROM School of Education, Box 23501, S-200, 45 Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Countries; Global Approach; Higher Education; *Peace; Social Change; Student Development; Teacher Education; *Teacher Role; *Values
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the need to prepare teachers for the role of agents for a culture of peace. The paper calls for the cultivation of vision, a capacity to see the potential for positive development in learners and constructive change in society. It notes that the core values in a culture of peace are: environmental sustainability, cultural diversity, human solidarity, social responsibility, and gender equality. For each of these values there is a complementary human capacity to be developed through teacher education, making it possible for teachers to cultivate these values and capacities in their students. These capacities are: ecological awareness, cultural competency, global agency, conflict proficiency, and gender sensitivity. The paper suggests a number of recommendations to help promote developments in these directions, addressing them to UNESCO, ministries of education, and educational and professional associations. (BT)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 432 527

Peace Education Miniprints

No. 99

May 1999

EDUCATING THE EDUCATORS: THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS FOR A CULTURE OF PEACE

Betty A. Reardon

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Bjerstedt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SO 031 009

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EDUCATING THE EDUCATORS: THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS FOR A CULTURE OF PEACE

Betty A. Reardon

Dr. Betty A. Reardon, New York, discusses in this text the need to prepare teachers for the role of agents for a culture of peace. Education of teachers is the necessary and essential means of developing the capacities needed. One significant attribute to cultivate is vision, a capacity to see the potential for positive development in learners and constructive change in society. Core values in a culture of peace are: environmental sustainability, cultural diversity, human solidarity, social responsibility, and gender equality. For each of these values, there is a complementary human capacity to be developed through teacher education, making it possible for teachers to cultivate these values and capacities in their students. The capacities are: ecological awareness, cultural competency, global agency, conflict proficiency, and gender sensitivity. A number of recommendations to help promote developments in these directions are addressed to UNESCO, ministries of education as well as educational and professional associations.

Betty A. Reardon, Ed.D., is Director of the Peace Education Program, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. Long active in a number of international organizations and movements, she has an unusually extensive experience of peace education, illustrated in several basic books in the area, including the 3-volume UNESCO publication "Tolerance: The Threshold of Peace" (1997).

This paper was prepared for the World Conference on Higher Education, UNESCO, Paris, October 1998. It was delivered at the Panel "Education for a Culture of Peace," organised by the International Association of University Presidents / UN Commission on Disarmament Education, Conflict Resolution and Peace. A few minor revisions have been made by the author in the present version for "Peace Education Mini-prints".

Educating the Educators: The Preparation of Teachers for a Culture of Peace

Betty A. Reardon
Peace Education Program
Box 171, Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

Teachers: Essential Agents for a Culture of Peace

As the discourse on the meaning of and possibilities for a culture of peace has begun to unfold, the focus has been on the problems to be overcome and the policies to overcome them. Little, however, has been written about the processes through which we will develop the capacities for properly diagnosing the problems and creating the policies, and even less about the human agents who will conduct the processes. There appears to be an unspoken assumption that the necessary leadership will appear when the political climate permits, emerging from a citizenry we already recognize as the world-wide, proactive, political force of global civil society. The assumption which underlies the assertions to be presented here, however, is distinctly different. My core argument is that intentional education, particularly the tertiary education of teachers is the necessary and essential means to developing these capacities and preparing the agents who will apply them.

In presenting this argument, special emphasis is placed on the second and fifth questions posed in the theme paper prepared by the International Association of University Presidents and the IAUP/UN Commission on Disarmament Education, Conflict Resolution and Peace as the basis for this debate (*The Role of Higher Education in Promoting a Culture of Peace*, 1998, p. 4). These questions raise issues related to the development of a paradigm for peace education as a vehicle for the realization of a paradigm of peace and to the ways in which UNESCO can forge alliances with universities toward that end. I will address what my experience of forty years in peace education leads me to believe to be some of the essential components of the paradigm, while asserting the primacy of the role of educators, particularly in public, formal education, in the preparation of both citizenry and leadership to become the agents for the

conceptualization and development of a culture of peace.

Each theme panelist speaks from an academic discipline; my observations are from the discipline of education which accounts for the assertion that the education of teachers may well be the most crucial of all intentional strategies to bring forth a culture of peace in a world so devastated by the multiple and ubiquitous forms of violence that constitute the war system, that as our basic theme paper observes is a primary characteristic of the present paradigm which sustains cultures of violence. It has, as we note, had significant influence over the paradigms and practices of education common to our universities, a circumstance intensified in the latter half of this century by the Cold War. As the motivating concern of this paper is the education of the general citizenry, it will confine itself to the education of the teachers who prepare the general citizenry for their roles in society, the economy and public life. The substantive suggestions related to values and concepts, however, I would argue are applicable throughout tertiary education. At the very least, they should inform a standard liberal arts education.

To achieve the pedagogical purposes set forth here, I profoundly believe that the notions of *enlistment* and *training* which currently characterize the paradigm as applied to teacher education must be extended and complemented by those of *vocation* and *formation*. And I am equally convinced that focus on skills must be complemented and extended by humane values and human capacities.

Further, I hold that a major catalytic agent in releasing the potential of classroom teachers as a significant contributor to a culture of peace would be adequate and appropriate recognition of the public service of teachers. Next to the family, the most significant agents of the socialization of the citizenry have been teachers. Even in these days where media "educate" our young, teachers have developmental influence. Virtually all societies expect and prepare teachers to transmit the dominant social values and guiding ideologies of their respective societies. We must now not only expect that teachers will transmit the values of a culture of peace. We must urge that they be intentionally, explicitly and systematically prepared to do so. For this service to peace, they must, I repeat, be accorded the respect and reverence truly commensurate with the extent of their social responsibility, a respect such as that offered to teachers in times and societies which have seen education as the means to better lives for people and greater achievements for the society, not simply as technical preparation for the production system or for competition with other nations. The vision,

values, capacities and skills of teachers more than any other factors in education determine the quality and direction of the socialization of the young in the public institutions charged with preparing them to function constructively in their respective societies. Thus, it is the tertiary education of educators, both formal and non-formal, that is the most important sector in higher education with respect to the possibilities for the emergence of a culture of peace (*Declaration*, Section 1; *Framework*, para. 23, see below).

Possibilities and Responsibilities for Education for a Culture of Peace

UNESCO itself has well defined some of the pedagogical goals and social purposes of education for peace in such documents as the 1974 *Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms* (referred to as *Recommendation*) cited in our theme paper and the 1995 *Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy* (cited and referred to as *Declaration* or *Framework*). Like all of its policy statements and guidelines, these definitions are directed toward member states, NGOs and educational institutions. While the statements deal with education in all its forms and at all levels, this paper is addressed primarily to those responsible for the quality of teaching in our schools, the institutions of higher education devoted to the preparation of those who will become classroom teachers in public, government supported schools, to those who serve in ministries of education, to those who will in turn become teacher trainers or professors in colleges and graduate schools of education. All are agents who affect the schools, and "Proposals or educational change find their natural place in the schools...institutional policy lines have to make peace, human rights and democracy both a matter of daily practice and something that is learned" (*Framework*, para. 20). None of the recommendations made here nor any those made by UNESCO that these recommendations seek to specify and implement will be realized without the commitment of member states, the active involvement of ministries of education, and the preparation of teachers. Public schools are the institutions through which states articulate the fundamental values that are to guide, they purport, guide their policies and inform the national ethos. The authenticity of those values can be effectively assessed by what is offered to the citizenry in its schools, what is taught to the young, how it is taught, and, most significantly, by *whom* it is taught. No curriculum, no pedagogy, nor even any course of study has so significant an effect on learners, the influence over the result of the learning

process as does the teacher. Thus, the main and fundamental purpose of teacher education for a culture of peace should be the formation of members of a profession committed to the principles of peace and capable of engendering similar commitment and imparting the skills of peace making and peace building to their students.

It is these skills and the values which motivate their development and application that should form the core goals of education for a culture of peace. The means and mechanism for their inclusion in teacher education now exist. They have been clearly identified; appropriate and effective methods have been devised by theoreticians and practitioners; and they are now applied in schools, colleges and universities in many countries. There is an active and growing interest in peace education and peace studies as well as peace research. Peace education, as distinct from peace studies, is primarily the task of elementary and secondary schools, whether it is presented as a specific subject matter or it is also infused through other subjects. There are many and varied teaching approaches, making it possible to educate for a culture of peace at all grade levels and in all subject areas. The commitment of states to and the implementation by ministries of broad scale public education for peace is possible.

Peace studies is a multidisciplinary field of study now offered in many universities, providing students with an opportunity for scholarly inquiry into the problems of war, conflict, violence and the various forms of injustice, economic deprivation, political oppression and environmental problems that give rise to conflict and war. More important, the field also provides for exploration of alternatives to war, multiple approaches to national and global security, conflict resolution, human rights and non-violent social change. Many peace studies students go into professions where they can practice the arts of peace, conflict resolution and social change and development. Some even seek out graduate degrees in peace studies or conflict resolution or related fields to extend the professionalism they bring to their careers, or to become professors of peace studies to teach coming generations of university students. As with school curriculum, there is no paucity of materials, methods or teaching personnel for the introduction of peace studies on a far wider scale in the world's universities. IAUP Commission on Disarmament Education argues that all universities should offer such studies, and all university students should have an opportunity to undertake the study of the arts and skills of peace.

However, while both desirable and necessary, even massive introduction of peace studies into the world's universities would not

adequately meet the educational needs to produce the paradigm shift required by a culture of peace. For this purpose, we need public and compulsory basic education to include peace education for all the world's elementary and secondary schools. But we are a long way from such circumstances, and we are not yet well versed in the special characteristics and practices of teacher education necessary to achieve such circumstances.

Little of the growing activity in peace education and peace studies has affected standard offerings and practices in teacher education. While there has been a long tradition of various forms of international education and, more recently, multicultural education, conflict resolution studies, human rights education, development education and gender studies in a peace perspective (much in these latter three areas has been done by UNESCO and other UN agencies, including UNICEF, UNIFEM and DAW, among others), all of which share some goals with peace education, explicit and intentional teacher education for peace, however, is still seriously and, I would say dangerously, limited. My own program is one of only three in the United States in departments or schools of education. (I hope some who read this will be able to challenge this statement and cite more such programs; but even then, whatever the additions, they are far from adequate.) All teachers everywhere should be educated for peace. Indeed, *must* be so educated to achieve a culture of peace. Comparatively few are.

Since UNESCO, as indicated, has well defined in its two landmark statements, the 1974 *Recommendation* and the twenty-year assessment of the *Recommendation*, the 1995 *Declaration and Framework*, the purposes and has outlined the pedagogical goals of education for peace, there is no need to rehearse them here. My purpose is rather to initiate a discussion of the essential conditions to their fulfillment and to emphasize some of their most fundamental aspects, especially of the 1995 *Framework*. Indeed, the intention of this paper is to serve as a tool for initiation of action toward the implementation of these goals and purposes in modes and with methods consistent with the principles and guidelines articulated in various UNESCO statements on a culture of peace. It is in these latter statements that we find some of the clues to the significance of vocation and formation. "In a culture of peace there would be space to express human creativity....[It] will be the fruit of an active struggle to realize human values...." (*Women's Contribution to a Culture of Peace*, UNESCO Expert Group Meeting, Manila, April 1995). The schools should be such spaces for creativity and teachers should be preparing learners to participate in the struggle.

It is clear from these statements, as I will detail below, that the most significant content areas for teacher education for a culture of peace are those that deal with universal human rights, cross-cultural understanding and communication, nonviolent conflict resolution, critical thinking and ethical decision making, social and ecological responsibility, all subjects which should be presented with specific relevance to the local, daily lives of the learners within the framework of our planetary system. "The whole of education must transmit this message and the atmosphere....and curriculum...should link the global interdependence of problems to local action." (*Framework*, para. 17). While there is no paucity of curriculum materials nor of teaching methods to introduce these subject areas into the classroom, lamentably, there is very little in required, formal teacher education which prepares teachers to use these materials and methods within the affective, human and social framework I would argue is necessary for any education, but most especially teacher education to become a force for a culture of peace. For that preparation to become a force, i.e., a vibrant, committed and effective energy, for a culture of peace, peace education must be a primary purpose of all teacher education and all pedagogical goals should be formulated toward that end.

Vocation: The Basis of Teacher Formation

Without the commitment of national education policies to the *formation* of teachers capable of and committed to becoming such a force, schools throughout the world will be deprived of this essential catalytic element, teachers *of* a culture of peace because they are teachers *for* a culture of peace. Vocation is the most fertile ground in which to cultivate formation. In short, the best peace educators are professionals who have chosen their field because they are *called* to contribute to the formation of a citizenry committed to and capable of bringing about the social, political and economic transformations that would comprise a culture of peace. Vocation and formation are, thus, the keys to the development of a generation of teachers who will be the main agents of the necessary and fundamental cultural transformation.

I want to make it clear that asserting the need for cultural transformation does not refer to any particular culture or system, but rather to those globally shared social realities and the multiple forms of cultural validation of violence as a necessary means to what are argued to be essential social ends. The specifics of the cultural changes to transcend violence will vary from culture to culture, but I know of no culture in the

world where there are no elements of violence blighting significant numbers of human lives, from gun violence in the schools of supposedly stable nations to lethal and genocidal violence in nations suffering from social and political upheaval.

Violence is a tragic universal of our planetary society, and it will require a planetary commitment to renounce and overcome violence to assure that any people in any circumstances can transcend the particular violence which they suffer. The fundamental and essential transformation for peace that all cultures must embrace and pursue is that of renouncing violence and war as legitimate means to political, social or economic ends. Indeed, it is a commitment to the reduction and elimination of violence that informs the vocations of the dedicated, creative teachers who for years have been actively and systematically educating for peace; who, without institutional help or support, have produced many of the tools that could be used to implement serious commitment of member states to the goals of their calling. In many nations, there are individual teachers, and some in associations, who are even now living out a commitment to the vocation of education for a culture of peace.

It has been years since I have heard serious professional discussion of teaching as a vocation, a calling to serve. This is not to say, as I indicated above, that there are not practicing teachers who are consciously, vocationally motivated in their professional endeavors; that the concept of service is not a significant element in the missions of teacher education institutions; nor that many teacher educators do not model teaching as a vocation. It is rather to suggest that the instrumental and technical values that so influence this period in human history have also had a profound influence on teaching as a profession and as a practice. It is quite understandable that growing populations to be served, larger numbers becoming aware of the need of education for economic well-being, and in many cases diminished resources to support public education (in no small measure due to the increase in resources devoted to a perceived if not real need for instruments of violence to provide national security) have resulted in efficiency and speed becoming values in education, as they have throughout our cultures in most spheres. Indeed, given the facts and the needs of education for national development, I would not argue against the imperatives of enlistment and producing as many teachers as quickly as possible, while not undercutting other social needs. (It should be noted, however, that there are periods in some societies when there have been gluts of very well prepared teachers in advantaged countries. But on a world

scale the ranks to serve those in the most need are almost always far too slim).

As instrumental, technical and narrowly economic values have overshadowed the more humane, traditional values of education, the social value placed on teaching has declined as the value of more lucrative, materially productive professions has increased. Respect is accorded to the size of income rather than the social significance of the work. For instance, in my country those who work in child care, who are charged with the well being of a large portion of the human future of our nation are among the lowest paid. Nor am I not unaware of the size of the salaries of certain "star" professors, nor of the fact that their stardom was not accorded for work done in the classroom or with students, nor that teaching has less value than research and publishing, even in graduate schools of education. All this while the *craft* of teaching has been polished and honed with ever more effective instructional methods, and the *art* of teaching viewed as little more than skill at practicing the craft. Teaching at its best is the art of facilitating the creativity and autonomous learning of students and of selecting the most appropriate tools of the craft of teaching to do so.

There is no doubt that the craft of teaching, the mastery of instructional methodology and skills that is the goal of "teacher training," is an absolutely essential component of teacher education. Effective teaching cannot be achieved without the mastery of the necessary skills and the capacity to select among them for the multiple purposes of most instructional tasks. However, what is given little attention are the human and social capacities and values of those who are being trained in the mastery of teaching skills. I submit that adequate teacher education comprises formation as well as training. Whereas *training* is the development of capacities for particular, educative interactions between teacher and learners, *formation* is the evocation and articulation of the motivating values that call teachers to engage in those interactions to achieve both personal satisfaction and social goals. Aptitudes for both should be ascertained when accepting applicants into teacher education institutions. Skill development is largely the result of the efficacy of the instruction provided in teacher preparation. Professional formation depends primarily on the human conditions of their professional preparation as well as what the students or teachers in training bring to the learning process, the motivations and values noted above, their world views, creative capacities and personal attributes.

Personal Attributes; Criteria for Enrollment: Professional Skills; Criteria for Employment

These attributes cannot be assessed by entrance exams, even those that call for essays on why the applicant hopes to become a teacher. Relational and interactive assessments are by far the best means to reveal them. This is most especially the case when seeking candidates who will be teacher-agents for a culture of peace. Peace and a culture which would sustain it is largely a matter of positive human relations and constructive, mutually enhancing social interaction, among nations and peoples, groups within societies, and certainly among and between the young and those who socialize and prepare them for their roles in society. The capacity and the desire to achieve such relationships with others in general and learners in particular is an essential attribute of the teacher for a culture of peace. This capacity must be as carefully and systematically cultivated in students of teaching as are the skills of instruction in which competency is often the test to determine employment or assignment to a school. Teacher formation comprises the cultivation of this and other essential capacities.

Another significant attribute to be assessed and cultivated in those whom we will charge with educating the young in the ways and behaviors of peace is vision, a capacity to see the potential for positive development in learners and constructive change in society. The literature on peace education has long advocated creativity and imagination as qualities essential to designing and achieving the goals of peace. Creativity is also among the values endorsed by the *Framework* (para. 17). It is usually addressed as something to be nurtured in the young by the curricula and methods applied in the schools. We must, however, take into account that such learning objectives cannot be pursued by teachers whose education has neither been informed by vision nor involved efforts to encourage visionary attitudes and creativity among those preparing for the classroom.

Too much of what does pass as teacher formation is devoted to helping them to become transmitters of present cultures rather than the cultural transformers needed for education to be a route to a culture of peace. In earlier days and simpler societies, teachers were often initiators of change as well as respected community leaders. Even today there are still many who are, if evidenced by nothing more than their vulnerability to authoritarian or repressive regimes. But for the most part we still educate teachers to be supporters rather than challengers of what is, or what the powerful say, should be. This condition serves to stifle creativity and change as it inhibits teaching for a culture of peace. Responsible teachers

are not revolutionaries nor are they indoctrinators of specific forms of challenge. But, if they are not themselves constructively critical and challenging, how can they prepare the young to be? If as the *Declaration* asserts (Preamble, Section 1), "education should promote...the building of a culture of peace and democracy," then educators must be able to help their students to learn how to be constructive critics and nonviolent agents of change in their own societies.

These attributes of creativity and critical thinking must be tempered by the commitment to concepts of the universal, fundamental worth and responsibility of the human person and nonviolent social orders that inform our notions and standards of human rights. As the training element in teacher education should provide all teacher candidates with instruction about "the ethical, religious and philosophical bases of human rights, their historical sources, the way they have developed and how they have been translated into national and international standards..." (*Framework*, para. 17), so the formation of teachers should include reflection on the human meaning of the standards, the social and behavioral values they seek to cultivate and the ways in which they should inform all human relations, interpersonal and intercultural, as well as the political, social, economic and intracultural relations addressed by the standards.

A teacher's knowledge of and social and political commitment to human rights standards should be complemented and animated by a deep and motivating belief in the universal and fundamental worth of the human person. While this belief is manifested and articulated in distinct and different forms by the world's various religions, it is integral to most of them. The student-teacher relationship in which respect for human dignity and human responsibility is experienced by both can be a model for how all authority should be guided by this value. And it is through the relationships among and between students that teachers help to guide and structure that the schools provide their most powerful lessons in human relations that socialize the young for the larger world. Students are more sensitive to teachers' personal attitudes toward them and how they manifest or negate the values of human dignity and human responsibility than any other personal attribute of a teacher.

Social Values and Human Capacities: Guidelines for Content and Methods

If formation is to become equally important with training in teacher education for a culture of peace, content and method must also be reviewed

and restructured in the spirit of the *Framework* which "calls for a transformation of the traditional styles of educational action" (para. 2). Most of all, it requires that all educational practices be seriously assessed to determine in what ways they might contribute to a culture of peace, and more specifically, in what ways educational content and practice contribute to divisions and animosity among peoples and nations. Our theme paper has noted that, among other subjects, the teaching of history has often been such a factor. So, too, has much of the other content of school curricula that is directed toward engendering a strong sense of national identity and unwavering loyalty to the learners' respective states. National identity and loyalty are of themselves positive attributes of citizenship. However, when the cultivation of these attributes have employed exclusionary, ethnocentric instruction, they have contributed to alienation and competition among peoples and nations, factors which perpetuate a culture of intolerance, war and violence. Teacher formation needs to address and resolve the educational and social problems such past educational practices have spawned.

If schools are to become "ideal places for the exercise of tolerance, respect for human rights, the learning of democracy and learning about the diversity and wealth of cultural identities" (*Declaration*, para. 2.2), then teachers must be thoroughly and specifically prepared to make them such. The values, attributes, capacities and skills of teachers more than national policy determine the atmosphere and the success of schools. If the "atmosphere of the [school] must be in harmony with the application of democratic standards" (*Framework*, para. 17), teachers must be committed to democratic values and skilled in democratic practice at a level of integrity and efficacy that can only be achieved by a professional education that involves holistic, humanistic formation and democratic training. Only a more holistic and integrated professional preparation will "help teachers to link the education process more closely to real social life and transform it into the practice of tolerance and solidarity, respect for human rights, democracy and peace" (*Declaration*, para. 3.2). Teachers themselves must be enabled to cultivate such capacities if they are to forge these links in their classrooms.

These capacities and others to be defined here arise from the fundamental values that have been cited as integral to the mission of UNESCO and to the evolution of a culture of peace. These values are among those that should form the basis of the formation of the curriculum of teacher education to implement the *Declaration* and *Framework* of

Action in the spirit of a culture of peace. It also should be kept constantly in mind that, like all peace education, the curriculum of the schools and the teacher education institutions which educate their staffs, always aware that "wars begin in the minds of men," has as its central purpose the facilitation of learning toward the avoidance, reduction and ultimate elimination of the institution of war and all violent structures, social practices and personal behaviors. Within the practice of peace education we view violence as any avoidable, humanly inflicted harm to persons, societies and the natural environment, including all the living entities who share it with us. Thus, non-violence is the main ethical principle that illuminates all the core values enumerated below.

The values cited here are certainly not the only ones that should inform the higher education of teachers. They are, however, essential and among the most comprehensive, and, like human rights, they are indivisible, interdependent, and interrelated. They are the core concepts of a system of values to be elaborated into culturally specific and appropriate component value. A primary task of peace education is to universalize these concepts and values, a task shared with the growing field of human rights education. We hope to form teachers who are not only committed to these values, but capable of using them as guidelines in developing in themselves and their students the capacities to live by them and work for their realization in their respective societies. These core values are: environmental sustainability, cultural diversity, human solidarity, social responsibility, and gender equality.

For each of these values, there is a complementary human capacity to be developed through teacher education so that they in turn, through the application of particular skills to be imparted by training that is integrally related to the values and capacities, can cultivate them in their students. The cultivation of capacities for peace making is the approach that I have long advocated as the most appropriate pedagogic approach to peace education (B. Reardon, *Comprehensive Peace Education*, Teachers College Press, New York, 1988, Chapter 6). However, the capacities noted here are broader than those advocated as integral to peace making because they have a deeper, more transformative purpose, the facilitation of learning that will capacitate our respective societies to bring forth a culture of peace. That is a goal beyond the ending of conflicts or the reduction of violence, a profound transformation of human consciousness as the true foundation on which "peace must be construed."

These capacities, which in turn depend for their development on the

vocational attributes of teacher candidates, form the base of a substantive content which should be offered to all teachers of all subjects and grade levels. This content is the basic knowledge all who are to live in a culture of peace must have about the problems which comprise the culture of violence and the possibilities which can lead to a culture of peace. The capacities which form the first (but not exclusive) components of the requisite change of consciousness, our fundamental world views are: ecological awareness, cultural competency, conflict proficiency, and gender sensitivity. Each is integrally related to the core peace values noted above. So that there is, as noted, an indivisible interdependence which interrelates the personal attributes (because all students, including student teachers, learn from each other), the peace values, the human capacities, the professional skills and the substantive content of teacher education for peace into an integral, comprehensive, and holistic curriculum.

The general dimensions of this curriculum, the rationale for which (with the exception of the ecological dimension) is clearly outlined in the *Declaration and Framework*, are indicated in the interrelationships. Realization of the value of *environmental sustainability*, recognized in the principle of humanly sustainable development, recommended subject matter for this curriculum, depends upon the *ecological awareness* of the world's peoples. The word ecological is used here not only to connote a focus on the profound significance of the natural environment to human well being, but even more, to emphasize a way of thinking about the world and the tasks of maintaining the planet on which all life depends. Ecological thinking, more than any other approach to reflection on the realities we face, enables us to observe, comprehend and appreciate the complexity of interrelationships, not only among the component parts of the living Earth, but of all the human systems and peoples that inhabit it. It is a way of encountering and addressing problems which attends both the future of the planet and the interconnections among the problems that threaten it. Understanding interrelationships as well as perfecting the particular instructional skills to illuminate them, should be established as major learning objectives of the higher education of teachers.

Cultural diversity is a value often cited in calls for the development of tolerance, usually seen as a prerequisite for a culture of peace. It features significantly in the teacher training resource UNESCO published in observation of the International Year of Tolerance (*Tolerance: The Threshold of Peace*, UNESCO, Paris, 1997, Unit 1 of 3 unit resource). It is the rationale for cross cultural and multicultural education directed toward

providing knowledge and understanding of cultures other than that which has designed the educational system in which the education takes place, qualities essential in "a pluralist society and multicultural world" (*Framework*, para. 8). Cultural proficiency, however, comprises more than cultural knowledge and understanding. It requires also the ability and the specific skills of constructive interaction with other cultures, among them languages taught in the spirit of UNESCO's Linguapax Programme. It involves as well a deepening of the fundamental understanding of human universals, the unity of humanity, recognizing that violence towards those regarded as "other" (*Declaration*, para. 2) is in the long-term violence toward self, one's own group, an understanding that applies ecological thinking to the realm of human cultures. *Cultural proficiency* is the capacity to be firmly grounded in one's own culture while being able to function comfortably in others without eroding or undermining basic cultural identity. It facilitates an understanding of culture as a living, dynamic aspect of the human experience which humans can develop and adapt to their needs and values. Without this understanding, a global culture of peace cannot emerge from present world cultures. The understanding of these two concepts, human unity and cultural change, are also to be included among the learning objectives of this curriculum.

The value which most directly complements that of *cultural diversity* deriving from the concept of human unity is human solidarity. *Human solidarity* like cultural diversity is becoming paramount among peace values due to the rapidly changing ethnic composition of so many societies, struggling to forge constructive, cooperative relationships among groups unfamiliar with each other's languages and cultures, a task made more complex as more newcomers seek to maintain the integrity of their traditions and cultures. Additionally, the increase in violent ethnic conflict makes it an even more urgently necessary value for world society.

Human solidarity is a product of a universal sense of human identity, cultivated by human rights education. A culture of peace on a global scale requires that the majority of the Earth's peoples comprehend and adhere to this value. The competency through which this value is realized is global agency. *Global agency* refers to the skills and practices of active citizenship in global civil society, and actions taken to benefit the whole of human society, including unfamiliar and distant peoples. With the emergence of the "education for international understanding" movement following World War II, "world citizenship" was identified as a learning goal to prepare students for participation in the international system. For

most educators, this meant educating for a form of national citizenship informed by knowledge of and concern about world issues. A few decades later peace education embraced "global citizenship" as a major goal, later refined to mean "global responsibility" (B. Reardon, *Educating for Global Responsibility*, Teachers College Press, New York, 1988) or the capacity and inclination to engage not only in active citizenship in regard to world affairs, but, when circumstances required, to take a critical stance toward the international policies and actions of one's own nation, if those actions were harmful to other members of the human family. More importantly, education for global responsibility aspired to develop capacities to propose constructive, nonviolent alternatives both to particular policies and actions, and also to the international structures and systems which served to constrain more constructive, less violent international behavior.

During the decades of the major world conferences in which NGOs through parallel fora and other activities surrounding the conferences and the preparatory processes, global citizenship took on new meaning. Private citizens as individuals as well as members of nongovernmental organizations had found an arena in which they could directly experience human solidarity, exercise the kind of international cooperation toward which the 1974 *Recommendation* aspired, and actively participate in world politics on a global scale. As global activists learned to influence the direction of international decisions through cooperative action in international settings, they developed the capacity of global agency. Many who do not participate in international gatherings are able to actively participate in global civil society through cyberspace, and many, like myself, also maintain worldwide contacts through the ordinary postal services.

The learning experiences gleaned through this activity can now be integrated into university curricula and certainly should be included in teacher education. My own program is offering such a course to candidates for the doctorate in education. The learning resources we are using are the United Nations and various of the NGOs who actively support and participate in U.N. activities and various other citizens' movements throughout the world with whom we will interact electronically and by post.

Global agency and human solidarity are mutually reinforcing. The core value is deepened beyond the essential affective concern for one's fellow human beings in all parts of the world, to an understanding of the essential principle of human unity; acknowledging that all human beings comprise one species with a common planetary future. Political efficacy, long the goal of national citizenship education, experienced in transnational

endeavors, develops the capacity to act on the principle and live the value. A culture of peace would produce and maintain a world civil order in which all people can act on principles of planetary ethics, and live by fundamental human values as they exercise their global citizenship. People must be explicitly prepared to do so, and teachers must be educated to prepare them.

Social responsibility for a culture of peace in all spheres of communal, national and international life calls for a range of skills of democratic practice, most particularly capacitation in *conflict proficiency*. Conflict proficiency comprehends a range of skills which facilitate a broad and varied repertoire of behaviors for processing conflict from prevention through resolution and reconstruction of cooperative relationships. There are a myriad of techniques of and cultural variations on conflict resolution, many of which are taught in schools to even the youngest students. Universities, including my own, offer degree programs in conflict resolution, theory and practice and alternative dispute resolution procedures and institutions. Such courses are not, however, as they should be, standard, even required courses in teacher education programs. While conflict prevention methods may be extended and improved, conflict as an integral component of human life, often necessary to constructive social change will continue to confront us. No skills are more essential to daily living, social relations and political efficacy than those of conflict processing, including, I must emphasize, skills for reconciling and reconstructing in post conflict situations. These are skills essential to both personal and public life that will be a fundamental necessity to maintaining the peace system a culture of peace would create to supplant the war system. Without competency in nonviolent conflict processes war cannot be abolished.

Gender equality, articulated by the United Nations since its founding as "equality between men and women," has been acknowledged as an essential peace value, stated in both the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, the term "gender equality" has more profound meaning than the legal equality and equality of economic opportunity that informed the discourse on women's rights and women's role in development in the decades prior to the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. It refers to one of the most complex, delicate and confounding issues to be faced in the conceptualization of a culture of peace, and also one of the least understood.

Gender is not a synonym for sex. It is not an alternative definition of the biological designations of male and female. In all societies, gender is

socially constructed within the particular culture of each respective society, and there is great variety in cultural concepts of masculinity and femininity or of the "gendered" person, male or female. Gender is defined and assigned by the culture, and in most societies, feminine gender is almost universally seen as belonging to the domestic realm rather than the public, and subservient to the masculine which is assigned control of the public sphere, usually including communal resources. It is associated with such attributes as cooperation and accommodation whereas the masculine is assumed to be challenging, even confrontational. It is evident that gender role assignment, and the socialization which instructs men and women in their respective gender roles, has served to create and maintain a fundamental and, virtually universal, inequality between women and men, an inequality which is a violation of fundamental and universal human rights. During the years of the International Decades for Women, from 1975 to 1995, most member states have come to recognize the negative social and economic, as well as the legal and political, consequences of this inequality. UNESCO's Culture of Peace Project has placed great emphasis on this obstacle by focusing some significant attention on Women's contribution to various approaches to peace and conflict resolution. The project has also begun to explore the negative and limiting consequences of rigid gender roles to men as well as women. They have especially emphasized the need to develop and encourage gender sensitivity, defined here as the capacity teacher education must cultivate if teachers are to educate for gender equality.

Gender sensitivity is that capacity which enables persons to differentiate between biologically determined attributes and culturally determined social roles and to understand the human inequalities and limitations to the full human potential of both men and women that often result from those roles. Understanding gender inequalities and all forms of discrimination against and oppression of particular human identity groups is a fundamental objective of human rights education, an essential complement to other components of comprehensive and holistic peace education such as conflict studies, environmental education and inter-cultural instruction advocated as a route to the achievement of a culture of peace.

The cultivation of gender sensitivity is an area of teacher education which clearly illustrates the integral relationships among personal attributes and vocation, formation and training aspects of teacher education, and how they develop values, capacities, and skills. These interrelationships are

especially clear in human rights education. The personal attribute of respect for human dignity which calls persons to the teaching vocation and motivates them to undertake human rights education is the basis for extending the value of human equality to gender equality. The value of gender equality like those of racial equality, ethnic, religious and political tolerance all derive from the core and comprehensive value that has given rise to human rights movements and standards, *human dignity*, the acknowledgement that all human beings are of fundamental worth and all are responsible to act in accordance with their worthiness. No other value is more essential to a culture of peace. Indeed, it can be argued that were the majority of the world's peoples to embrace this value, a culture of peace would be inevitable, because human beings would be ethically opposed to and affectively incapable of inflicting violence on each other. (Please note that this does not infer that societies would forswear or even necessarily be able to abandon the occasional use of nonviolent force or coercion to maintain social order. It would mean, however, that violation of human rights for personal or public purposes, even in the course of restraint by public authorities would not be tolerated.)

Teacher formation to cultivate the capacity of gender sensitivity should form a significant element in the general human rights education that should be included in all teacher preparation. Formation for gender sensitivity can serve as a model for most of the aspects of human rights education that teachers should receive. In this time which we hope is the age when human society comes to recognize that human survival depends in large part on the development of a culture of peace, the substantive content of human rights education may be the most crucial. Of all world problems those that obstruct the human rights of so many of the human family to the fulfillment of their basic human survival needs, the realization of their human dignity and the opportunity to exercise social responsibility are those which most clearly demonstrate the consequences of the culture of violence which now envelopes us. Knowledge and comprehension of these human rights denials and the conditions that produce them is effective in inspiring the exercise of social responsibility and, in some, the catalyzing of creative capacities to envision the alternatives that will be the building blocks of a culture of peace. None of these denials is more universally experienced nor has a more profound effect on human relations, society or our cultural values than those imposed by the global inequality of men and women some have referred to as "gender apartheid." Thus, it is, that knowledge of the denial of the human rights of women are an effective

catalyst in the formation of gender sensitivity, the capacity to practice gender equality that teachers must bring to their relationships with their students and to the atmosphere of their classrooms.

Affecting the classroom atmosphere to manifest the value of gender equality requires that the capacity of gender sensitivity be complemented by skills to impart relevant aspects of the realities of gender discrimination and to assure that it does not occur in educational practice. Gender sensitive skills training for human rights education should be developed and introduced in culturally appropriate forms into teacher education in all countries. As with the curricula and pedagogic methods for peace education, conflict studies and other aspects of human rights education, practitioners of women's and gender studies and gender equality trainers have devised various methods and techniques which can be quickly adapted to these purposes. With a strong enough commitment to a culture of peace and an understanding of the urgency of gender equality to its realization, the cultivation of gender sensitivity and the other essential teaching capacities, complemented by the development of a repertoire of classroom skills, teacher preparation for a culture of peace can be undertaken without delay by most educational systems.

Recommendations

These foregoing proposals, assertions and arguments do not ignore the multiple and problematic realities of schools, universities and teacher training colleges. I acknowledge that, in themselves they pose additional difficulties and complexities, but the process of cultural transformation we are asked to contemplate could be nothing other than difficult and complex, constantly challenging and, at times, daunting. Yet we have to take up these or similarly daunting challenges if we are to even approach the task. Keeping in mind the actualities in which we work, the following recommendations are made, each of which is as practical and possible as the tasks are challenging. They are addressed to UNESCO, ministries of education, educational and professional associations.

UNESCO, in the fulfillment of its mission to construct "the foundations of peace," could undertake some or all of the following:

- Organize a special summer school on education for a culture of peace.
- Set up an expert task force to design and develop a core curriculum for teacher education, placing special emphasis on *formation*.

- Establish in cooperation with IAUP and in association with UNESCO Associated Universities a global network of teacher education institutions to specify, develop and refine the proposals of the expert task force in culturally appropriate ways, placing special emphasis on *training*.

- Coordinate a survey conducted by ministries of education to identify currently available curricula and practices in teacher education for a culture of peace, especially in the areas of conflict resolution, peace studies, human rights education and gender equality.

Ministries of education to better serve the needs of preparing the citizenry of their respective countries for a culture of peace could initiate the following:

- Hold national conferences on teacher education to review and discuss the findings of the surveys on curricula and practices for a culture of peace, identify needed developments and design programs for pre-service and in-service teacher education for a culture of peace.

- Establish a national panel of expert consultants to work with individual universities and other teacher education institutions to facilitate implementation of the proposals of the UNESCO task force and the practices devised by the teacher education network of the UNESCO Associated Universities.

Educational and professional associations in cooperation with IAUP and other international education NGOs could:

- Set up professional commissions on teacher education for a culture of peace to formulate suggestions for ministries of education and to provide curriculum change and development services for teacher education institutions.

- Sponsor and organize periodic intensive in-service courses in education for a culture of peace on national and regional levels.

Many other recommendations for action could and should be made by this conference. All such recommendations should be formulated with the intention of we, ourselves, the participants, taking the major responsibility for the implementation of our recommendations. I would also urge that we keep in mind the two fundamental conditions which must pertain if teachers are to be capacitated to fulfill their potential as major contributors to a culture of peace. We must revitalize the role of professional formation in all teacher education programs. And, with as

much vigor and speed as possible, we must reinstate in all of our societies the practices and attitudes which accord to teachers the respect and honor that their professional responsibilities and social contributions call for.

References

- Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy.* (1994/1995). 44th session of the International Conference on Education, Geneva, October 1994; endorsed by the General Conference of UNESCO, at its twenty-eighth session, Paris, November 1995.
- IAUP/UN Commission on Disarmament Education, Conflict Resolution and Peace. (1998). "The Role of Higher Education in Promoting a Culture of Peace." A paper developed for UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education, Paris, October 5-9, 1998.
- Reardon, Betty A. (1988a). *Comprehensive Peace Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, Betty A. (1988b). *Educating for Global Responsibility: Teacher-Designed Curricula for Peace Education K-12*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, Betty A. (1997). *Tolerance: The Threshold of Peace, Unit 1*. Paris: UNESCO, 1997.
- Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace, and Recommendation on Education Concerning Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.* (1974). Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (1995). "Women's Contribution to a Culture of Peace," Report of an Expert Group meeting, Manila, April 25-28, 1995.

"Peace Education Miniprints" are published and distributed by the R&D Group
"Preparedness for Peace" (address: School of Education, Box 23501,
S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden).

ISSN 1101-6418

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

25